

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to correct the contradiction noted by the Examiner, thereby rendering moot the § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 2. Applicant also has amended claims 3 and 10 to correct the cited informalities and render moot the § 112, second paragraph, rejection of these claims.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(b) rejection of claims 1, 4-7, and 13 over Tripathi. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite, among other things, a test bed having a restriction mechanism which restricts rocking of the internal combustion engine; wherein the test bed is equipped with the displacement mechanism; and wherein the displacement mechanism comprises an arm supported on the test bed in such a way as to be able to rotate around a predetermined rotational axis, including the features previously recited in claim 8, which the Examiner held to be allowable subject matter, so claim 1 and its dependent claims are now allowable.

Applicant also has amended claim 9 to be an independent claim, including the features of the base claim and intervening claims. The Examiner held that claim 9 recites allowable subject matter, so claim 9 should now be allowable.

Applicant has added new claim 20 to round out the protection to which the applicant is entitled.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 8, 2005

By:



James W. Edmondson
Reg. No. 33,871